

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of pending Claims 1-19 and 21 and new claims 22-24 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patent over claims 1-20 of co-pending application No. 09/812,392. This noted co-pending application is also being examined by the Examiner of the present application, and the claims of the present application are believed to be patentably distinguishable from the claims of the referenced co-pending application.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ridgley et al., U.S. Patent 6,583,800. Applicant respectfully notes the Examiner probably meant to issue a rejection under 35 USC § 102(e), and the rejection is being considered as such.

With regards to the '800 patent to Ridgley, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention disclosed therein is substantially different from the present invention, and is related to navigating through a hierarchy of visual information, including moving forward and backward through nodes and branches while navigating through content, and interacting directly with the content of information units. One object of Ridgley is to seamlessly integrate computer function and a user interface. The teachings noted by the Examiner in column 9 and 10 provides specific details of the navigation through visual information. The noted teachings in column 12 provide discussion on the clarification process that is repeated until the user's desires are satisfied, whereby the user can navigate forward and backward along a path taken down the information hierarchy. It is noted that the IDENTITY area acts as a last-in-first-out (LIFO) buffer that provides for this navigation. Ridgley specifically states in column 13, lines 13-18 that the items

in the history display are spatially configured in a two dimensional array rather than linearly in an outlined form and is the implementation that is believed to be novel and useful. The MEMORIZATION function allows the contents to be moved from CONTEXT area to the DESIRE area. Columns 16 and 17 provide a good illustration of the navigation.

The present invention, as recited in independent Claim 1, is directed towards reconstructing previously displayed information during a specified time period. Support for this limitation is found in Applicant's specification on page 15, lines 3-13, and page 16 lines 7-20. The visual stimuli previously displayed during the specified time period is reconstructed to advantageously allow an analysis of same. In contrast, the visual navigation tool of Ridgley et al provides a series of content sub-areas including detailed information about a selected unit at the hierarchical level immediately below the previous layer. This allows the user to see the "history of the user's navigation", but there is no reconstruction of a previously displayed portion, rather, there is just a display of the navigation. Reconstruction is defined as "to construct again", which is different than simply redisplaying information. Moreover, Ridgley fails to teach or suggest reconstruction of a previously displayed portion during a specified time period. Rather, there is simply a display of the navigation during use, but the displayed information is not be displayed as a function of a specified time period.

Dependent Claim 2 further recites that this data is a network address of online content that is displayed during the specified time period. Dependent Claims 3-7 further recite other variations of the data used to reconstruct a previously displayed portion during the specified time period.

Previously presented dependent Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form, and is believed to be allowable over Ridgley. Support for this limitation is found in Applicant's specification on page 14 line 22 – page 15 line 2. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion of obtaining a user's eye position, or using same to reconstruct a previously displayed portion of the content. Accordingly, independent Claim 8 is believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons.

Previously presented dependent Claim 9 is also rewritten in independent form, and recites reconstructing a previously displayed portion of content as a function of a user's pupil dilatation. There is no teaching or suggest in Ridgley of obtaining a user's eye dilatation, or, reconstructing data as a function of a user's pupil dilatation.

Dependent Claim 10 stems from independent Claim 1, and further recites displaying a portion of a parent web page in a child page as a function of a user input during the specified time period. Again, Ridgley fails to teach or suggest displaying content as a function of a specified time period. Dependent Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 1 and further recites masking an area of the content during reconstruction that was not displayed during the specified time period. Support for this limitation is found in Applicant's specification on page 16 lines 7-14. The prior art to Ridgley fails to teach or suggest masking an area of content during reconstruction that was not displayed during a specified time period.

Dependent Claims 15-18 further recite distinguishing attributes of the present invention that are neither taught nor suggested in the prior art to Ridgley.

Independent Claim 19 is a system claim, and defines the invention over the cited prior art to Ridgley as previously discussed.

Independent Claim 21 recites a computer readable medium including instructions for receiving a specified time period to reconstruct the online content, which is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art to Ridgley.


New independent Claims 22-24 are directed to the novel feature of providing reconstruction based on a user's eye position. Again, Ridgley fails to teach or suggest any feature of same.

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claim 1-19 and 21-24 are allowable over the cited prior art, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Additional fees to cover the new claims is enclosed.

A Two month Extension of Time is included herewith. No additional fees are believed due, however, the Examiner is authorized to debit deposit Account No. 50-1752 for any additional fees that may be due.

If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment where possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Klinger
Registration No. 34,365

Please send all correspondences regarding this matter to:
Jackson Walker L.L.P.
2435 North Central Expressway, Suite 600
Richardson, Texas 75080
972.744.2940 (Office)
972.238.3302 (Fax)